

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. Claim 1, 2, 5 and 6 have been amended to correct typographical errors. The amendment to this claim was not made to overcome the prior art or to narrow the scope of the claim. A replacement Fig. 9 is being submitted concurrently herewith. The title has been amended. No new matter is presented.

The drawings were objected to due to a minor informality. Fig. 9 has been corrected in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was objected to due to a minor informality. Claim 5 has been amended to correct this informality. Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The title of the invention was objected to because it is not adequately descriptive. The title has been amended to more clearly indicate the nature of the invention. Applicant requests that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 6-7, and 13-14 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kuroshima (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,134 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites "a compression system which compress the image data by a compression method corresponding to the image size designated with the designating means and sends the compressed image data to the memory." In other words, the compression method is determined based on the image size.

Kuroshima discloses that a RAM stores image data of an image frame, the image data being read by the CRT and visually displayed. The image data stored in the RAM has a resolution of 100 dpi (col. 5, lines 15-19). Although Kuroshima discusses the resolution of the image data (in dpi), it does not discuss the image size. The Examiner states that the CPU would have the function for designating the image size to the display means. However, this is not supported by the disclosure. It would not be necessary for the image size to be determined and relayed to the display means. The image data, together with the desired resolution, would be sufficient for the display means to display the image. Further, while the Examiner may be correct that Kuroshima discloses compressing the image data, Kuroshima is completely silent with respect to the image size and only discusses image resolution, which is not the same as the image size. The image size in claim 1 refers to the size of the data file which stores information representing an image.

Claim 6 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 1. Claim 7 is allowable for the same reasons claim 1 is allowable, Kuroshima does not disclose compressing the image data according to its size. Claim 13 is also allowable for this reason. Claim 14 is allowable at least due to its dependency from claim 13.

Kuroshima also fails to disclose that the compression is performed according to the determined image size. The Examiner states that the claimed compression system which compresses the image data according to the image size is disclosed in col. 6, lines 17-21. However, Kuroshima merely states that the image is read by a scanner at a certain resolution, stored in the image area IMEM and converted to a lower resolution by the compression circuit. This portion of Kuroshima does not disclose that the compression method is chosen according to the image size. In fact, Kuroshima does not even disclose more than one compression method so it would be unnecessary to use a compression method based on a the image size, as claimed. Again, the Examiner appears to be equating the claimed image size with the image resolution of Kuroshima. Respectfully, these are not equivalent concepts. Accordingly, Kuroshima fails to disclose or suggest the features of claim 1. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima as applied to claim 13, and in combination with Yamagami (U.S. Patent No. 5,745,251). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from claim 13. Since Kuroshima fails to disclose compressing image data based on its size, and Yamagami also fails to disclose this feature, the features of claim 15 are not taught or suggested by the cited art, either alone or in combination. Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 325772015900.

Dated: September 11, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By Deborah S. Gladstein

Deborah S. Gladstein

Registration No.: 43,636

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300

McLean, Virginia 22102

(703) 760-7753

Attachment: Replacement sheet (Fig. 9)